



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/541,924

07/11/2005

Makoto Horiuchi

OKUDP0118US

8479

51921 7590 07/03/2008

MARK D. SARALINO (MEI)
RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP
1621 EUCLID AVENUE
19TH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

EXAMINER

HOLLWEG, THOMAS A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/541,924	Applicant(s) HORIUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Thomas A. Hollweg	Art Unit 2879	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas A. Hollweg.

(3) Mark Saralino.

(2) Peter Macchiarolo.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wang (U.S. 2006/0071585), Perlo et al., (WO 03/058676).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners and applicant discussed whether the figures disclosed in Wang and Perlo showed a "woven or knitted mesh," as claimed in independent claim 1. Examiners maintained that the prior art figures showed the claimed limitation and that the rejection of claim 1 was proper. Examiners suggested that a timely filed amendment, limiting the claim to distinguish it over the prior art, would be considered..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Peter J Macchiarolo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required